

CAI
HW 700
-75P54

Government
Publications

[Canada] National Council of
Welfare

[General publications]

[G-5]

poor kids

a report by the
national council of welfare
on children in poverty
in canada

march 1975



national council
of welfare



conseil national
du bien-être social



CAI HW 60
-75P54

POOR KIDS

A Report by the National Council of Welfare
on Children in Poverty in Canada


National Council of Welfare
Brooke Claxton Building
Ottawa K1A 0K9

March 1975



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
POOR KIDS: WHO ARE THEY?	4
POOR KIDS, SICK KIDS	10
POOR KIDS IN SCHOOL	16
POOR KIDS AT HOME	24
ARE POOR KIDS BAD KIDS?	29
WILL IT ALWAYS BE THAT WAY?	34



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
University of Toronto

<https://archive.org/details/31761115574154>

INTRODUCTION

Canadians like to believe that ours is a society in which all children are born with equal chance to rise as far as their abilities will carry them. Though they begin their lives in very disparate circumstances, we comfort ourselves with the belief that success is as attainable for the child of humblest origins as the most affluent. The facts, however, are otherwise. To be born poor in Canada does not make it a certainty that you will live poor and die poor - but it makes it very likely.

To be born poor is to face a greater likelihood of ill health - in infancy, in childhood and throughout your adult life. To be born poor is to face a lesser likelihood that you will finish high school; lesser still that you will attend university. To be born poor is to face a greater likelihood that you will be judged a delinquent in adolescence and, if so, a greater likelihood that you will be sent to a "correctional institution". To be born poor is to have the deck stacked against you at birth, to find life an uphill struggle ever after. To be born poor is unfair to kids.

Of the 6.76 million kids under the age of 16 in Canada at the time of the 1971 census, 1.66 million were poor. This report is about those kids. It is about the lives they are living today and the prospects for the years that lie ahead of them. It is about growing up without - without as much food as other kids get, without the toys, the clothes and the outings that other kids get. And it is about growing up marked with the stigma of poverty instead.

It is important that we, as Canadians, understand the effects of the present inequitable distribution of national income on those who suffer the misfortune of being born to families living

below the poverty line. It is important that we understand as well that the thousand cruelties that poverty visits on the children of the poor can be ended. Children need not grow up in poverty in Canada because there need not be poverty in Canada.

This report is about the world of poor kids today and the prospects of it being different tomorrow. In it we will look not only at the present situation of Canada's poor kids - who they are, where they are and how they are - but also at recent developments in Canada's social security system - the November proposals of the federal-provincial conference of welfare ministers and those of the federal budget two days earlier.

The tax system and the income security system together determine the patterns of income redistribution in this country. The changes that are made in these systems as a result of the present federal-provincial review will affect the lives of every one of Canada's poor kids. New programs that are adequate to raise Canada's poverty families out of poverty will transform the futures of these poor kids. Inadequate programs will leave them facing the grim prospects that mark the landscape of their lives today.

Canada stands today on the threshold of a new beginning. For almost two years, federal and provincial ministers responsible for welfare in this country have been assessing the patchwork of programs which today constitute income security in Canada and preparing the design of a new approach based on the principle of guaranteeing an adequate income to all. That process has brought us to the threshold of a new beginning; but the decisions which still remain will determine whether or not we cross that threshold.

These decisions will shape the society that Canada will be in the years to come. They will determine the life chances of

the one-quarter of Canada's children living in poverty today and of their younger brothers and sisters who will be born in the tomorrows that lie ahead. We hope that this report, in describing the world of poor kids today, can contribute to a better understanding of the choices that must be made for tomorrow.

POOR KIDS: WHO ARE THEY?

Every ten years Canada conducts a census. The results of that census generate volumes of data on the life situations of Canadians. What we were interested in learning from it was about poor kids. How many children are living in poverty, where in Canada are they, and what are the circumstances of their lives? Our definition of poverty was that of Statistics Canada: Where more than 62% of family income is required to provide the minimum necessities of food, shelter and clothing, the family is living in poverty.

Because the costs of these items vary between communities of different sizes, Statistics Canada has produced poverty lines for each of five different kinds of areas - from metropolitan centers of more than 500,000 population to rural areas of less than 1,000 population.¹ Applying Statistics Canada's poverty lines of 1970 (the year for which the most recent census gathered data on Canadian family incomes) to this census data, we find that of the 6,759,373 Canadian children under the age of 16, 1,657,017 of them - 24.5% - were living in poverty.²

The census found substantial numbers of children living in poverty in every region and province in Canada. The highest proportion was in Newfoundland where almost half of the province's children (45.3%) were in families with incomes below the poverty line. More than a third of the children in Saskatchewan (38.4%), Prince Edward Island (37.3%) and New Brunswick (34.9%) were likewise living in poverty. Even in the "rich" provinces of Ontario and British Columbia, where the lowest proportions were found, more than one child in six was living in a family with less than a poverty level income.

	<u>Number of children in poverty</u>	<u>% of total number of children in the province</u>
Newfoundland	92,783	45.3
Prince Edward Island	14,111	37.3
Nova Scotia	75,983	29.8
New Brunswick	75,520	34.9
Quebec	528,843	28.1
Ontario	400,690	17.1
Manitoba	95,874	31.6
Saskatchewan	114,081	38.4
Alberta	135,150	24.8
British Columbia	116,301	17.9
Yukon	1,160	17.8
Northwest Territories	6,489	42.4

As this table shows, proportions and numbers tell very different stories. While Quebec has a lesser proportion of its children living in poverty than do six other provinces, and Ontario the lowest proportion of all, the greatest number of poor kids - 929,533, almost 60% of the Canadian total - live in these two provinces.

Looking at the Canada-wide census data in terms of population areas rather than regions, we find the greatest numbers and highest proportions of poor kids in rural areas of less than 1,000 population. The difference between rural areas and the four classifications of urban areas is particularly striking in view of the remarkable consistency between the four urban classifications.

<u>Population of area</u>	<u>Number of children in poverty</u>	<u>% of total number of children in the area</u>
500,000 or more	413,247	21.4
100,000-499,999	180,939	17.8
30,000- 99,999	122,679	20.8
1,000- 29,999	288,103	20.6
Rural (farm and non-farm)	652,049	35.7

In spite of the poverty level for rural areas being so much lower than that for the various urban groupings, more than one in three rural children are in families which fail to reach it. This pattern does not hold true throughout rural Canada, however. There are very substantial differences between the rural areas of the various provinces and territories. Half or more of the rural children in Newfoundland (54.6%), Saskatchewan (53.6%), Manitoba (50.0%) and the Northwest Territories (61.1%) live in poverty, compared with only 19.2% of rural children in British Columbia and 22.8% in Ontario. Alberta, which ranks behind only Ontario and British Columbia in its low province-wide proportion of children in poverty, evidences a wide disparity between the proportions of children in poverty in its two large urban centers, Edmonton and Calgary (16.7%), and in its rural areas (44.2%).

	<u>Number of rural children in poverty</u>	<u>% of total number of rural children in the province</u>
Newfoundland	50,728	54.6
Prince Edward Island	10,694	44.6
Nova Scotia	40,518	35.3
New Brunswick	42,652	42.9
Quebec	157,869	37.1
Ontario	106,361	22.8
Manitoba	53,381	50.0
Saskatchewan	78,974	53.6
Alberta	69,811	44.2
British Columbia	34,995	19.2
Yukon	723	28.4
Northwest Territories	5,329	61.1

Looking again at the census data, this time in terms of family characteristics, we find that 1,314,576 poor children (79.3%) were in families with both parents present, while 296,398 (17.9%) were in one-parent female-headed families and 46,028 (2.8%) were in one-parent male-headed families. This heavy preponderance of two-parent families among the poor is not surprising in view of the fact that the vast majority of Canadian families are in this category. Far more significant is the proportions in poverty within each of these three categories.

Among children in two-parent families across Canada, 21.2% were in poverty; among those in male-headed single-parent families, 33.7% were in poverty; among those in female-headed single-parent families, an incredible 69.1% were in poverty.

Moreover, this overwhelming probability of poverty for children in families headed by mothers alone held true in all provinces and all population categories. By province it ranged from a high of 76.8% in Manitoba to a "low" of 59.9% in Prince Edward Island. By population category it varied even less - from 71.5% in areas of 30,000 to 99,999 population to 67.7% in areas of over 500,000 population.

Rates of poverty for children in male-headed one-parent families showed far more marked variations. By province, these ranged from 52.8% in Saskatchewan to 24.6% in Ontario; by population area, from 25.6% in urban areas of 100,000 to 499,999 population to 43.1% in rural areas.

But all of these numbers do not begin to tell the story of children in poverty in Canada. If anything they obscure it, swallowing up all of its individual realities in their massive composite dimensions. Each of the 1,657,017 individual realities are what poverty is, not their totals. It is the boy in northern New Brunswick who writes:

My name is Pierre and I'm 13 years old. I'm the eldest of seven children. What makes me suffer most is not having a house, having to live in a shack where it's always cold and too small for all the family. There are nine of us. The seven children all sleep together in two 36" wide beds - pushed together in winter for more heat since we don't have enough blankets. We have an old broken-down stove. In the winter we push the beds near the stove, but it's dangerous.

Autumn isn't very much fun either. It's cold also, and the rats come in - you have to watch so they won't bite the smaller children. This week they chewed

off part of the pump so we have no water and the neighbors tell us their well is low, so we do without water. We're not always clean when we go to school.

How many of these realities are so stark? A thousand? Ten thousand? A hundred thousand? The census figures tell us nothing. Clearly not all of Canada's poor kids live in hovels. Not all need cope with rats. For many - perhaps most - of Canada's poor kids the reality of poverty is less dramatic, its effects more subtly destructive. A 14-year-old boy from Quebec writes:

I love sports but I can't participate in anything because we have no money for equipment. We can never do anything because of lack of money. I feel as if it will always be this way.

And the tragic truth is that he is probably right. For the child of poverty the prospect is that it will 'always be that way'; and the more times that this grim prospect is brought vividly home to him the more likely it becomes. Even the boundless optimism of youth is little match for the harsh realities with which the poor child is confronted every day of his life.

POOR KIDS, SICK KIDS

The chains of poverty that encircle the children of the poor are forged link by link in a process that often begins even before the child is born. The government of Canada's 1974 working paper on health begins with the assertion that "good health is the bedrock on which social progress is built".³ And perhaps it is. But good health and poverty seldom go hand in hand. For the children of the poor it would have been more pertinent to note the ill health on which their life prospects are grounded.

Two years ago the National Council of Welfare issued One Child, One Chance, a report on nutrition and the children of the poor. In that report we discussed how the physical and mental development of the foetus can be affected by the adequacy of the mother's diet during pregnancy, and how such an adequate diet was often beyond the financial reach of poor mothers. The result is that many poor kids begin paying the price of their poverty in stunted growth that began before they were born.

England's National Child Development Study, a continuing monitor of 16,000 British children born in one week of 1958, found that the children of the poor were far more likely to be born underweight and premature than those of the non-poor. Among the children of the poor one in 12 weighed 5½ lbs. or less at birth, compared to one in 20 among the non-poor. One in four poor children was born before the 39th week of pregnancy, compared to one in six non-poor children.⁴

In this country the Montreal Diet Dispensary has pioneered in demonstrating how such results can be avoided. By supple-

menting the diets of poor mothers during pregnancy the Diet Dispensary has been able to virtually eliminate differences in birth weight and perinatal mortality between infants of the poor and of the non-poor. Among private patients of the Royal Victoria Hospital the incidence of perinatal mortality (i.e. - foetal deaths after 28 or more weeks' gestation and infant deaths within seven days of birth) is 13.21 per thousand births; among public patients of the same hospital it is 19.18. Among public patients given diet supplementation by the Dispensary, however, the incidence falls to 14.32.⁵

The British Child Development Study found a difference of 1.3 inches, at age seven, between the heights of children of the two highest economic groups and those from the lowest group. By age eleven it found the heights of 42% of the disadvantaged children to be less than the minimum normal height for that age, compared to only 18% of non-poor children. It also found poor children more likely to miss school due to illness, be victims of home accidents, and exhibit hearing impairments and speech impediments. Among disadvantaged children the proportion affected by rheumatic fever, infectious hepatitis, meningitis or tuberculosis was double that of other children - one in 16, compared to one in 32.

A 1969 study of 222 elementary school children at St. Catharines School in a low-income neighborhood of Montreal's east end provided dramatic evidence of the health problems suffered by poor kids in this country:

- a) 21.3% of the children were inadequately nourished;
- b) more than 22% were retarded in their height and weight development;

- c) 27.5% were retarded in their physical-mental coordination;
- d) 39.1% of the children had a history of diabetes in the family and 20% had a family history of tuberculosis.⁶

A subsequent study, conducted in 1971 in eight schools in disadvantaged areas of Montreal, found more than half of the 3,424 children examined to be physically ill. More than 10% were so ill that they required hospitalization.⁷

The advent of Medicare in Canada during the 1960's was supposed to end inequality of access to medical care among income groups in this country. But the evidence is that it has not. A study of "Economic Class and Access to Physician Services under Public Medical Care Insurance", which examined comparative rates of utilization of medical services in Saskatchewan between 1963 and 1968, found that:

Even after six years of experience with medical care insurance, a disparity by income class still remains. That is, the lower economic classes still display less accessibility to the services of physicians.⁸

Many factors can be cited to account for this, including the simple fact that lifelong behavioral patterns are not transformed overnight. But other reasons include free access not really being quite free. For a mother to take a sick child to a doctor may involve taking a taxi to get the child there - and taxis are not free. It may require a babysitter for the children being left at home - and babysitters aren't free either. Even assuming the visit to a doctor takes place, its only result

may be a pharmaceutical prescription - and for all but a few categories of the poor, free medical care does not include free drugs.

In Beyond Services and Beyond Jobs: People's Need to Grow, we cited the results of the social-mental health study conducted in the mid-1960's by the Urban Social Redevelopment Project in a Montreal inner-city area. As part of that study, the incidence of psycho-social behavior problems among area children was measured in relation to family income. The index used was based on 12 types of behavior problems; the higher the incidence of these problems, the higher the index measurement. The results showed a direct correlation between income levels and incidences of behavior problems. Children from families earning less than \$2,400 annually had a higher index score than those from families earning between \$2,400 and \$3,600 who, in turn, had a higher index score than children in families with incomes over \$3,600.⁹

A study of children aged four to six being carried out by the Department of Child Psychiatry of the St. Justine Hospital in Montreal has found "statistically significant major differences" in the emotional development of poor and non-poor children. The study reports:

A minority of the disadvantaged children show good emotional resources in their first nursery years (age 4), and their development remains adequate through first grade. Most of them however present an inadequate development all along...

... Advantaged children reach a state of serenity which allows them to enter easily into the world of formal learning

and latency. Disadvantaged children are still too often under the domination of a dangerous fantasy world which delays their entry into formal learning and makes it problematic.¹⁰

What are the dimensions across Canada of the ill health suffered by the children of the poor? No one knows. The only nation-wide survey of illness ever undertaken in this country was the 1950-51 Canadian Sickness Survey. It found a much higher prevalence of ill health among the poor than among the non-poor. No similar study has been carried out in the 25 years since.

Nutrition Canada's survey of the nutritional status of Canadians was completed in 1972 and first results were published in 1973. Analysis of the survey data on the basis of family income levels, however, was not accorded a high priority by Nutrition Canada. It is now 1975 and this data is still not available, though we are told that it is now in its final stages of preparation.

The lack of urgency with which Nutrition Canada appears to have regarded this aspect of its study stands in vivid contrast to the Department of National Health and Welfare's 1970 submission to the Senate Committee on Poverty, in which it stated:

There is universal recognition that nutrition is a critical factor in poverty. Dietary inadequacies and under-nutrition, combined with the other deprivations attendant on poverty, cause health deterioration. This sets up the cycle of decreased performance of all activities, mental

apathy, and incapacity for initiative or self-help. Medical research has linked malnutrition to anemia, low resistance to infectious diseases, mental retardation, and mental illness... Undernourishment may reduce the ability to acquire the education necessary for escape from the poverty cycle. Quite apart from impairment of mental development arising from deficiencies of nutrition during foetal life and early infancy, the complex of mental and physical lassitude attendant on undernourishment, the distraction of attention caused by the distress of nagging hunger, and unfitness because of recurring illness all can stultify the education of a child of even normal mental endowment.¹¹

From the British study, from the Montreal studies, from the Canada-wide study of 25 years ago it is clear that poor kids suffer various forms of ill health and retarded development to a greater degree than do their more affluent peers. How much greater? What kinds of ill health and to what degrees? Until Canada's medical research community decides to take a far greater interest in this area we will not be able to say. It is a highly revealing commentary on the directions taken by health research in this country that virtually none of it has been concerned with the effects of poverty. That poor kids are disproportionately sick kids seems to be of little concern to Canadian health scientists.

POOR KIDS IN SCHOOL

Canadians have traditionally placed a high value on education, both for the opportunities for self-realization which it makes possible and for the economic advantages it provides in terms of finding and succeeding at a job. The data correlating educational achievement and subsequent income is so clear as to make it unquestionable that persons with higher educational preparation are more likely to earn higher incomes. The 1972 family income data from Statistics Canada shows this strong relationship between level of education and average family income:¹²

<u>Level of Education</u>	<u>Average Family Income</u>
0-4 years	\$ 8,192
5-8 years	9,263
Some secondary schooling	10,862
Completed secondary schooling	12,268
Some university	14,681
Completed university	18,714

In view of this clear relationship between level of education and subsequent income, what is the influence of family income on the educational aspirations and attainment of children? Does coming from a poor family by itself mean that a child will have lower educational goals and/or be less successful in school?

A research study which examined data on 150,000 students attending 373 Canadian secondary schools found that students'

educational intentions corresponded to their family's income. Students from lower income families had lower educational aspirations. Those from higher income families had higher hopes for their educational attainments.¹³

Does Money Matter, the report of a study of 9,000 Ontario high school students and 3,000 of their parents, explored the relationship between socio-economic class and educational aspirations. The authors summarized their findings as follows:

... from these data we feel safe in inferring that family finances must be a factor in the limited educational horizons of lower class youth. This is not to say that the so-called non-financial or cultural factors are non-existent or do not play a part. We felt, however, that to overemphasize them is to forget that social class is the structure of inequality and deprivation, and that the absence of family resources helps to create attitudes and prospects of limited life chances so that the cultural factors become adaptations to the inequality of the society.¹⁴

The data compiled by this study showed a far stronger desire to leave school early among students from low-income families than among those from higher income groups. Only 43% from the lowest socio-economic group wanted to complete grade 13 before leaving school, compared to 76% in the highest group. Similarly, far fewer students from this low-income group expressed interest in attending university - 28% compared to 63% of those in the top group. On the other hand, far more students from the lowest socio-economic group were interested in earning money rather than continuing their education - 40% compared to 12% in the top group.

This same pattern is reflected in a study of educational aspirations of native youth in Edmonton, which shows that they are generally lower than the aspirations of non-native youth. 75.5% of the native students said that grade 12 was their educational goal; only 9.8% aspired to "some" post-secondary education. Among non-native youth, on the other hand, only 41.6% saw grade 12 as their ultimate educational goal, while 50% hoped to complete university.¹⁵

Two years after the completion of the Does Money Matter study in Ontario, a sociologist conducted a follow-up study of the students who had been in grade 12 when the initial data was collected.¹⁶ While the first study focussed on aspirations, this follow-up looked at what had actually occurred. For those students who were in the five-year program (which is the normal one for university entrance), 87.7% of students of high mental ability from the upper socio-economic class had completed grade 13 in comparison to 68.3% of students of similarly high mental ability in the working class. What was particularly striking in these findings is that there was a higher percentage of upper class children with low mental ability who completed grade 13 (71.0%) than this 68.3% of working class children with high mental ability who did.

Looking beyond the completion of grade 13, this Ontario study found an even more marked class difference with regard to attendance at university. Among students of high mental ability, proportionately twice as many from the upper class as from the working class were attending university: 65.2% compared to 33.2%.

A study carried out among grade nine students attending central schools in Newfoundland found that students from the

lowest income group represented more than three times as great a proportion of those who dropped out of school at this level (23%) as of those who remained (7%).¹⁷

The 1971 census reports 432,245 children aged 15 in Canada, of whom 391,310 were attending school full time at the start of the 1970-71 school year.¹⁸ School attendance is compulsory at this age almost everywhere in Canada unless exceptional circumstances requiring non-attendance are established. Only 8.6% of non-poor children aged 15 were not attending school; 12.4% of poor children of this age were not.

At age 15 children should be in at least grade nine. Among non-poor children 82% had reached this level or higher; 18% had reached only eighth grade or less. Among poor children the picture was significantly different: 67% had reached grade nine or more while 33% had attained only grade eight or less. In other words, almost twice the proportion of poor children had fallen behind in school by age 15 as non-poor children - one in three compared to one in six.

Family income is not, of course, the only factor affecting school performance. Comparing the performance of poor children in different family situations, there is evidence of the considerable role played by the mother. Among 15-year-olds in poor two-parent families 67.6% had reached grade nine or more and in poor female-headed one-parent homes the figure was 68.3%. But in poor male-headed one-parent homes the proportion in this performance category was only 56.4%. (This same pattern holds true, though to a lesser extent, among children in non-poor families, where the counterpart figures for average or better school performance were 82.6% for children in two-parent families, 80.0% in female-headed one-parent families and 74.6% in non-poor male-headed one-parent families.)

As suggested by the Edmonton study of school aspirations, the school performance of native youths lags substantially behind that of other Canadians. The census found that among all Canadians aged 15 and over attending school full time, only 9% were in grade eight or lower; among native students this figure was 37%. Among those aged 15 to 24 who had ceased attending school, 51% of native youth had left with less than a grade eight education, compared to 17% of non-natives.¹⁹

What explains all this data? In the face of the clear value for future economic well-being of extended education, why do poor kids tend to aim lower and drop out first? Why do they tend to do less well than their mental ability would indicate? The answer is not a single simple one. What happens to poor kids in school is the result of one factor after another, none of them alone responsible, but each shifting the odds against success for a poor kid a little further than the last.

First, the poor child is more likely to come to school underfed - even hungry. And a hungry child cannot learn. Further, as the British Child Development Study documents, poor children are absent from school due to illness more often than non-poor children. At age eleven, it found that one in 11 poor kids missed one to three months school in a year, compared to one in 25 non-poor children. Further, one in 50 poor children missed more than three months school in the year due to illness, compared to one in 250 among the other children.

The seeds of this ill health, as we have seen, have often been sown before the poor child is even born, with a 50% greater likelihood that he or she will be born underweight and premature. And at this point the child enters the world of his or her

impoverished family - a world in which food is invariably in short supply, housing is overcrowded and underheated, and adequate warm clothing often unavailable.

A teenage girl writes:

During the winter I lined my shoes
since I had no boots. But the snow
kept getting in, so I had flu all
winter.

And in the overcrowded housing of the poor, when one child gets the flu they all get it - because they usually share the same bedroom. So sometimes school is missed because of illness; and sometimes it is missed to avoid illness. When the child has no boots and the snows come, should a mother send her child to school, knowing that the child is likely to come back sick, or should she keep the child home till either the streets are cleared or the welfare or family allowance cheque arrives to buy boots with? And sometimes a poor kid has to stay home to look after a younger child who is sick - because the parents (or parent) can't stay home without losing the job that is the family's only source of income.

It's not that low-income parents place a lesser value on education than their middle-class counterparts. On the contrary, the Ontario study, *Does Money Matter*, found that poor parents place a high value on education. But in the world of the poor there are a lot less options than in a middle-class home. And whatever the parents' views, the abstract concept of education doesn't mean much to a child. For him there is only the concrete reality of school. And school is very often the place where poor kids feel most painfully what it means to be poor - the place where they learn that the only escape from humiliation is to get out... get a job... get some money.

In primary grades the poor kid is likely to go to a neighborhood school. Typically, in an inner-city neighborhood such a school will be among the oldest in the system, with fewest of the facilities which characterize contemporary education. This makes it among the least desirable places to teach in, so it probably has a good number of the least desirable teachers. But the one thing it is likely to have is a homogeneous school population; at least the poor kid will find himself surrounded only by other poor kids.

When he moves on to secondary school, however, this insulation from the world of other kids is almost certain to end. Here he will find the world that is closed to him. Here he will find the stigmas, the slights and the shames of being poor. This is where he will get his real education.

He will learn that school is the class project on what-I-did-on-my-summer-vacation that tells him how different he is. School is where the other kids wear the latest fashions and the poor kid learns how conspicuous she is in her second-hand clothes. School is where he fears to make new friends because he is ashamed for them to see his home, and where she is ashamed to go to the class dance because she has nothing appropriate to wear. School is where the special class outings cost 50¢ or a dollar that the poor kid hasn't got, so he can't go. School is where the kids swap tales of what they got for Christmas and birthdays and the poor kid learns that he isn't like everyone else - and wants to be.

School is where the child of the poor, who is restless, can't concentrate, is cranky and sleepy, is seen as a case for the psychologist - when what he likely needs is a real breakfast or lunch, not an analyst's designation as a problem

child. School is where they give homework - and the overcrowded home is where there is no place in which to do it. School is where you need a uniform and equipment for sports and these cost money the family just hasn't got. School is where the poor kid finds the world - and finds that he's been left out.

But teaching these lessons in life isn't all that schools do for poor kids. They also do things like "streaming" - tracking students into various programs on the basis of their abilities and interests. Only somehow poor kids (restless, cranky, etc.) keep getting streamed into the slow-learner classes - the streams that don't run very far.

The Canadian Teachers' Federation has reported on a study which found that there were 25 times as many inner-city pupils as there were suburban pupils in the seven-year program for "slow learners". On the other hand, two of the inner-city schools sampled had no students at all in the beginning year of the five-year "accelerated" stream.²⁰ Does Money Matter found that proportionately twice as many of the students from the top socio-economic group as from the bottom group were streamed into the five-year, university-bound program - 78% compared to 40%. On the other side of the coin, the proportion of poor kids in the program that didn't lead to university was more than three to one that of the top income group.

In view of what schools do to poor kids and what other kids do to poor kids at school, in view of the fact that they are, after all, only kids - no wiser in life than kids can be expected to be - the surprising thing is not that so many poor kids drop out, but how many do not.

POOR KIDS AT HOME

Home, for a poor kid, may be anything from an unheated shack without running water to an apartment unit in a giant public housing complex. Because the greatest numbers of the poor are found in urban centers, and only a fraction of them have been able to obtain accommodation in public housing, home for a poor kid is most likely to be some portion of an overcrowded, underheated, run-down building in a decaying area of the inner city.

As we have seen, most of them are in two-parent families, but almost a quarter are in families where only one parent is present. Whether the single parent is male or female (and the likelihood that it will be female is almost 7 to 1) the absence of one of the parents, coupled with the multiple implications of family poverty, is certain to increase the pressures on a poor child in the "carefree" years when his or her personality is being formed.

The pressures on his/her parent or parents are certain to affect the home atmosphere. We noted in *Beyond Services and Beyond Jobs: People's Need to Grow* that the potential for mental illness, alcoholism and other forms of personal dysfunction is distributed fairly evenly among social classes. But the extent to which that potential is manifested depends upon the stresses to which a person is subjected. The manifold burdens of coping with poverty will not generate dysfunction in all who are poor; but they will in many who would have been able to withstand the considerably lesser tensions of a more secure existence.

Even if the parents are as solid as granite in the face of adversity, the atmosphere of continual economic insecurity -

of being uncertain that next month's rent can be paid, that the groceries will last till the welfare or unemployment insurance cheque arrives (and the crisis when it is a day late in coming) - cannot help but affect a young child.

The charity hamper is a symbol of well-meaning generosity - to those who give it. It is a symbol of shame to the destitute who must accept it or be without food or necessary clothing. Even if he/she is too young to understand the reasons for it, the poor child nonetheless feels this shame, internalizes and shares it. If a poor kid gets to camp (and so few do) it is to a charity camp - and he or she knows it.

The cruel barbs about those on welfare - that they are lazy spongers or worse - cut deep into the psyche of the child who grows up on welfare. Those who offer these callous remarks insist they intend them only for those who could be working (roughly 3% of recipients; and then, of course, only if there were jobs for them - which there aren't) but they neglect to mention this 97% exclusion in their glib commentaries. The child of the disabled father or deserted mother knows only the bewilderment and hurt - and his self-concept is shaped by them.

The idealized North American family is one that participates together - family outings to the ball game, the museum and the movies, and picnics in the country. But ball games and museums and movies have admission charges, and there can't be picnics in the country without a car to get there in. Summer vacations - with the whole family living a common experience, rediscovering one another and restoring the fabric of relationships worn thin over the year - play an important part in modern family life; but like picnics and ball games, these too are denied the children of the poor. The family experiences that are so much a part of

growing up have all been wrenched out of the lives of poor kids. In their place is only an uncomprehending sense of loss at missing all of these experiences that other children get. And television has insured that poor kids know exactly what it is they are missing - from the advertised toys to the idealized family adventures.

Not all poor kids live with their own families. 50,000 Canadian children live in foster homes and, overwhelmingly, they are children of poverty. There is no Canadian data to tell us the exact proportion, but the British Child Development Study again offers solid indication. It reports that the probability of a poor child being placed in alternate care is more than ten times as great as for a non-poor child: that by the age of eleven more than 10% of the disadvantaged children had been placed in alternate care, compared to less than 1% of those from non-poor families.

Foster care has always been the welfare service which most starkly focussed the absurdity of Canada's income support provisions for children. A working poor family supports its children, however inadequately, on what little it earns - supplemented only by the modest family allowance of \$265 a year per child provided by the government. A welfare family supports its children on the inadequate welfare provisions and the family allowance. If a family cannot maintain a child on these amounts and surrenders it to be placed in foster care, the government provides the foster parents with two or more times the welfare allowance (plus the same family allowance) to care for the child.

In Ottawa, for example, the deserted mother of a teenage child can receive between \$64 and \$76 per month (depending on

the age of the child) from the welfare department for the maintenance of the child. If she cannot sustain it on this amount and surrenders it to the Children's Aid Society to be placed in foster care, the foster parent will receive \$142.47 per month for the maintenance of this same child.

The harmful effects of welfare provisions on family life are not limited to this particular example. The requirement that children's earnings be included with those of adult family members if they continue to reside in the family home discourages these children from part-time work (since it will be deducted almost dollar-for-dollar from the family welfare cheque) and virtually forces them to leave the family home as soon as they can take on full-time work. If poverty makes family cohesion difficult, welfare seems determined to make it virtually impossible!

This is illustrated particularly dramatically in the case of male single-parent families. While welfare is available to single mothers alone with dependent children, in most provinces it is not available to fathers alone in this situation. If the father cannot earn enough to pay for day care and homemaker services he is forced to give up the children. The Catholic Children's Aid Society in Toronto recently reported that low-income sole-support fathers were being forced to give up their children to institutional care because they couldn't support them on their own earnings and were not eligible for welfare support.

Poverty destroys people and it destroys families. Not all people and not all families. But in a world of pressures it adds more. It is a tribute to the remarkable strength and tenacity of Canada's low-income families that so many survive, parents and children scarred by the cruelties of suffering want

amidst a society of plenty, but nonetheless intact. Home, like school, is a learning experience for poor kids - learning how to do without the things that every child should have, how to live with the fact of being different.

ARE POOR KIDS BAD KIDS?

"Mommy, why are we poor?" is unquestionably the most heartbreaking question any mother will try to answer. Because our society insists that monetary reward is earned (whether it really is or not) then those who have nothing must deserve nothing - or so it seems to a young child. "Why are we poor?" means "Why are we no good?"... "Why am I no good?"

At school kids are generally left out of class outings and other extra-curricular activities for one of two reasons: either because they are being punished or because they can't afford the cost of participation. Again the association of being poor with being bad - being punished. And apart even from this association, what is the likely effect on anyone of being constantly set apart and left out? Only a youthful saint could avoid becoming defensive and hostile, surly and/or withdrawn.

Adolescence is an insecure time of life in which young people seek peer-group reinforcement to deal with the insecurities which mark their transition from childhood to adult life. Being one-of-the-gang provides a needed sense of belonging in this rudderless period. Not being one-of-the-gang is having these insecurities magnified. To be left out is to become an object for ridicule, the butt of cruel pranks and taunts. You either let them do it, or you get tough enough that they're afraid to do it.

Being a poor kid is either being helpless or being tough. And either option is a surefire recipe for future behavioral problems. If the child accepts to be helpless, what remains

of his/her self-confidence crumbles and progressive withdrawal into a fantasy world may occur. If the child chooses to be tough, his/her self-image reshapes itself to fit the new role.

A member of the Toronto Board of Education, whose ward includes a large part of the inner-city area, recently revealed that one-third of the suspensions from all city schools took place in his ward - which comprises only 6% of the city's school population.²¹ Learning how to be tough may solve some problems for a put-upon poor kid, but it clearly creates a lot of others.

A poor kid has to get by with what he's got. He learns to be "street smart" at a very early age. Beating the system to get onto a bus or into a theater without paying may be a game for some kids; it's usually a necessity for a poor kid if he wants to get in at all.

"Go play in the traffic" is a standard comedian's put down of a heckler. It's also very often the reality of a poor kid's recreational opportunities. Recently the Saskatchewan Department of Social Services conducted a survey of the accommodation situations of the province's social assistance recipients. Its report states that:

Of the 3,036 households with school age children, 2,413 or 79.5% stated that safe and adequate play space is not easily accessible.²²

If that is the case in a province that is among the least densely populated in Canada and whose largest urban center has a population of only 140,000, what must the situation be like in the core areas of such densely populated metropolitan centers as Toronto and Montreal?

In view of these things it wouldn't be surprising if poor kids - hardened, resentful, street smart and without adequate recreational outlets - were more often delinquent as adolescents than other kids. Whether or not this is in fact the case is impossible to know. The data that is regularly collected and reported is of apprehended delinquencies and dispositions - presumably some fraction of all delinquent acts actually committed. Since police activity is more heavily concentrated in inner-city than suburban neighborhoods and since a simple warning to the child and/or parent is more likely in a "nice" neighborhood than a tough one, the data tells us only what happens to poor kids compared to the non-poor, not the extent to which it was warranted.

In 1968 and 1969 a random group of children charged with delinquency in Vancouver was compared with a control group, matched for age, grade, sex and school with the group who had been charged. Of the total sample, 28% were from poverty homes, 72% from non-poor families. Of those who had been charged as delinquents, 32% were from poverty homes, 68% were not.²³ In view of the many pressures pushing poor kids toward delinquency, this 4% difference is remarkably small. It is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that it is not even a measure of actual incidences of delinquency, but of apprehended delinquencies for which the police chose to lay charges.

In addition to the disproportionate likelihoods of police contact in various areas of the city and the exercises of police discretion after contact, there are further exercises of judicial discretion once a child reaches the court. In general, courts prefer to place juveniles on probation than to commit them to correctional institutions. In Ontario in 1973, for example,

less than 25% of juvenile offenders were sent to such institutions - 1,367, compared with 4,165 who were granted probation.²⁴ But which 1,367?

It was not necessarily those who were found to have committed a statutory offence (as opposed to simply being found to have "committed a delinquency" - which can be as insignificant as truancy from school). Almost half of them - 619 - were placed under Section 8 of the Training Schools Act which authorizes such placements where no statutory offence has been committed. What then was the basis on which the courts exercised this discretion? If it wasn't what they had done, was it who they were? This appalling possibility may very well have been the case, because a study of training schools in Ontario has found an incredible 92% of those committed to these institutions were from low-income or working-class families.²⁵

The Vancouver and Ontario datas cannot be compared directly. The fact that only 32% of the juveniles referred to the court in Vancouver as delinquents were from poverty homes does not mean this same percentage holds true for Ontario. Moreover, "low income and working class" is a far broader categorization than the poverty classification used in Vancouver. Nonetheless, there is at least the suggestion from these datas of a considerable class bias in the disposition of cases of juvenile offenders. This may be so only in Ontario, and it may be happening at the court referral rather than sentencing stage, but the disparity between 32% and 92% is too mammoth to not raise serious questions about the evenhandedness of juvenile justice.

Are correctional institutions being used as dumping grounds for poor kids? If so, are the police responsible for this, or is it the courts? Or is it social workers who decide to wash

their hands of problem kids from poor backgrounds by recommending to the court that they be taken out of circulation? How much does the media image of poor kids as "slum kids" (tough and defiant, etc.) rub off on these kids, encouraging them to act out the role that is expected of them? How much are the perceptions of them by the police, the courts, the schools and the social agencies influenced by these stereotypes? There seems little evidence that poor kids are in fact disproportionately bad kids, but it may be that they are disproportionately treated that way.

WILL IT ALWAYS BE THAT WAY?

Throughout this paper we have talked of probabilities. There is no certainty as to how life will turn out for any poor child, only greater or lesser probabilities at each stage in his or her development.

We have drawn on what limited data there is in this country to document these probabilities, but have found nothing so comprehensive as the British Child Development Study. In clear terms it sets out the respective probabilities for poor and non-poor kids: a 50% greater possibility of being born premature and underweight, more than twice the likelihood of being less than the normal height at age eleven, twice the chance of contracting any of a number of childhood diseases, more than twice the probability of missing one to three months school in a year because of illness and five times as great a chance of missing more than three months.

For whatever reasons, Canadian social scientists have consistently ignored family income in their search for causes of social phenomenon. Thus, for example, a recent report of the Alberta Department of Health and Social Development on "Characteristics of Children Admitted to Child Welfare Institutions" states:

Knowing the problems with which the children came into care, it would be interesting to learn more about their family background; for example do the majority come from poor families..²⁶

The study then proceeds to examine the educational backgrounds of the heads of these families, the status of their

marriages and the states of their health. No reference is ever made to family income. Do a disproportionate number come from poor families? We strongly suspect so; but - typically - the study neglected to find out. Like their counterparts in the health field, Canadian social science researchers have evidenced a considerable determination to preserve academic irrelevance by ignoring variables so mundane as income adequacy.

In our discussion we have drawn on what Canadian materials are available - a handful of small-scale studies in the health field, several highly revealing studies in the education field, a few fragmentary studies in the juvenile justice area. We have also tried to go beyond these various sets of numbers to illustrate in the concrete terms of day-to-day experiences what the reality of these numbers is in the lives of poor children. But in all of these senses there is far more to the story than we have been able to tell.

The process by which poverty grinds down the natural optimism and enthusiasm for life of the poor kid is like the slow dripping of water on a stone. We have been able to cite only a few illustrations of this process which, day after day, at home and at school, undramatically and unremittingly shapes poverty's child into poverty's image. Some, of course, manage to withstand all of these pressures. However heavy the odds, some will succeed in beating them. But for most of poverty's young victims there will be no escape. When the cumulative effects of his growing up in poverty have convinced a 14-year-old boy that "it will always be this way" then, for him, it is a virtual certainty that it will.

In April of 1971 the National Council of Welfare issued its first report, a statement on income security. It began with these words:

No discussion of policy can take place other than in the context of a system of values. This is true of any area of policy, but of no area is it more obviously true than the area of social policy. All policy decisions represent choices and all choices reflect values. If it has become fashionable to present policy choices in the language of the technocrat, this does not mean that value choices have been removed or neutralized, just that they are not being identified.

After almost two years of working parties and task forces the federal-provincial social security review has reached the point where the value choices must now be made. This was spelled out quite clearly by the Minister of National Health and Welfare in a recent speech: "Income Redistribution: A Question of Community Ethics". The politicians will make their choices based on what they believe to be the community's choices.

There can be no hiding behind myths that we can't afford to ensure income adequacy to all Canadians. The recent federal budget proved that. The Minister of Finance redistributed \$1.75 billion for the 1975-76 fiscal year through reductions in the personal income tax alone. He redistributed another \$885 million of the 1975-76 national income by changes in sales tax and tariff provisions, more than half of this - \$450 million - through reduction of the sales tax on building materials.²⁷

All of this \$2.6 billion that the government has chosen not to collect represents a redistribution in the national income. But in what direction? The personal income tax cuts range from \$200 for those in the lowest tax bracket to \$750 for those in the highest. In other words, if you were too poor to

pay taxes you got nothing; if you were a low-income taxpayer you got \$200; but if you were already rich enough to be in the top tax bracket you got \$750. The rich got most, presumably because they needed it least. Are these our values?

The deduction of \$1,000 of interest and dividend income will, of course, be welcomed by all those with significant income from bank deposits and stock holdings. Self-evidently, these are not the poor. The Registered Home Ownership Savings Plan and cut in the sales tax for building materials are designed to benefit those in the home-buying market. Again, not the poor. Even the deduction of \$1,000 of pension income will benefit only the best-off of senior citizens.

Yet no one suggested we couldn't afford these tax cuts. Economists argued whether they were too much or too little economic medicine for a situation in which everything but the inflation rate was slowing down, but no one suggested we couldn't afford it.

A guaranteed adequate income that eliminates poverty in Canada will cost roughly the amount of these tax cuts - about two-and-a-half or three billion dollars. We can afford it exactly as easily as we afforded the tax cuts. The question is whether we choose to.

Following the federal-provincial conference of welfare ministers, held the same week the budget was introduced, it was announced that the ministers had narrowed their consideration of new approaches to meeting the social security needs of Canadians to three options: a unitary guaranteed income scheme and two forms of two-tiered guaranteed income programs. In settling on these three alternatives the ministers rejected three other options, all of which involved changes in family allowances only.²⁸

We are encouraged that the federal and provincial governments have at last recognized that mere tinkering with the patches of welfare's patchwork quilt is not enough. Only a new and comprehensive approach, based on the right of every Canadian to a share of the national income sufficient to enable him or her to participate fully in the Canadian community, can be adequate. Whether this new approach is by way of a single negative income tax, a two-tiered negative income tax or a two-tiered combination of negative income tax and refundable tax credits (the three options that the ministers are still considering), what it must embody is an adequate income, in dignity, for all. Each of these approaches is compatible with this goal and none, in itself, ensures it.

The present welfare system has been inadequate by every possible measure. Inadequate benefits, available only to restricted categories of applicants, has meant discrimination between citizens of equal need, dignity-destroying personal investigations, helplessness in the face of arbitrary determinations by officials - and hostility to the programs from all those whose needs have been ignored because they did not fit the categories. All of these must be avoided in the new program. This can best be done through the unitary approach of a single negative income tax system for which all would be eligible on the basis of their incomes alone. But all must be eligible; there must be no groups excluded.

Either of the two-tiered approaches could also meet this test, provided that eligibility for either tier was open to all. In such a system the individual would be free to choose either the higher-benefit-level-but-steeper-recovery-rate (upper tier) program or the lower-guarantee-level-but-lesser-recovery-rate

(lower tier) program, depending upon which was more advantageous in the light of the family's earning capacities in any given year. A two-tiered approach based on categories such as exist at present, however, while it would extend some benefits to those who are now entirely excluded, would also preserve all that is wrong with the present system, the discrimination between persons of equal need, the personal investigations, and the bureaucratic discretions.

The provision of social assistance by provinces and municipalities has been in a manner so degrading to recipients that many have felt it necessary to choose between their need and their self-respect. The results have been not only humanly destructive, but self-defeating as well. The new system must recognize the essential dignity of the individual and not undermine this as the price for financial support.

The new income security system, whatever its mechanism, must be based on an income guarantee level not less than the poverty line. Statistics Canada's most recent determination of these levels, in 1974 terms, ranges from \$7,601 for a family of four in metropolitan areas of more than 500,000 population to \$5,527 for the same family in rural areas of less than 1,000 population.²⁹ The ministers have already indicated that the new system will provide for provincial variances in benefit levels to take account of differences in living costs. What is essential is that the national standards be high enough, and the degree of permitted variance from province to province be small enough, to ensure that guarantee levels are at least equal to updated poverty line levels everywhere in Canada.

Whatever the mechanism employed, it is likewise essential that the negative tax rate applied to earned income not be so

high as to discourage those eligible for benefits from seeking to improve their economic situation through earnings. This applies not only to principal family breadwinners but to other family members, such as teenage children, as well. And it applies to mothers with dependent children and the handicapped and disabled too.

The confiscatory effects of welfare provisions which reduced benefits almost dollar-for-dollar when recipients engaged in part-time employment have not only been destructive of individual initiative and family cohesion but, in the long run, been self-defeating. The chances of a mother alone with dependent children returning to full-time employment when her children are grown are infinitely greater if she has been able to maintain part-time involvement in the work-world than if she has been entirely removed from it for a decade or more.

In the next few months the ministers and their officials will be weighing and refining their three prospective approaches and, at the end of this process, presenting a single detailed proposal. Whether that proposal is adequate or inadequate will reflect the ministers' assessment of Canadian community values - not a question of what the country can afford, but of what they believe Canadians are willing to invest in the well-being of present and future generations of Canadians. In the words of the federal Minister:

... the question will not be whether politicians ought to believe in a more or less egalitarian society, but rather whether they are able to "read" the community's values correctly, and express them correctly in terms of basic income levels, and in terms of income distribution generally.³⁰

What are Canadian community values? How much do we care whether for a 14-year-old boy "it will always be this way"? Does it matter to us if poor kids are hungry or sick, if they are shamed out of schools and into dead-end jobs from which they are the first laid off when the economy slows down? Do the aged and disabled matter to us? Do we care as much about them as about the millionaire industrialist who benefited most from this year's income redistribution?

If the ministers' reading is wrong - if their assessment of how much we care is too generous or not generous enough - then the debate will begin, and their proposals will be attacked from one direction or the other. In all likelihood, whatever their assessment, there will be voices raised from both sides. Which voices prevail will be the measure of what Canadian values truly are; and whether for 1,657,017 poor kids the future will hold more hope than the past.

The probabilities and likelihoods which we have described in this report will remain unchanged or be transformed to an extent that will be determined by our value choice. That choice, which we the Canadian community will make, will tell us a great deal about ourselves.

FOOTNOTES

1. Statistics Canada. Income Distributions by Size in Canada, Preliminary Estimates, 1973, Catalogue No. 13-206 (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974) and Revision of Low-Income Cut-Offs (Statistics Canada, 1973), unpublished paper. For details see Appendix.
2. Data compiled for the National Council of Welfare by Statistics Canada (User Inquiry Service, Data Dissemination Division, Census Field). For details see Appendix.
3. Canada. Minister of National Health and Welfare. A New Perspective on the Health of Canadians: A Working Document (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974), page 1.
4. Wedge, Peter, and Prosser, Hilary. Born to Fail? (London: Arrow Books Ltd., 1973), page 22.
5. Higgins, Agnes. "Nutrition and the Outcome of Pregnancy", a paper presented to the Canadian Public Health Association Annual Meeting, St. John's, Nfld., June 19, 1974.
6. Paquin, Antoine. "Problèmes de santé et d'éducation" from L'enfant en milieu défavorisé, the report of a seminar sponsored by the Montreal Catholic School Commission, April 18, 1970.
7. "Appalling Health Situation Found", The Gazette (Montreal), July 20, 1971.
8. Beck, R. G. "Economic Class and Access to Physician Services Under Public Medical Care Insurance", International Journal of Health Services, Vol. 3, No. 3 (1973), page 355.
9. Urban Social Redevelopment Project. Social and Mental Health Survey, Montreal: 1966 Summary Report.
10. Gauthier, Yvon, et al. "L'activité fantasmatique d'enfants de milieux favorisé et défavorisé: Evolution de 4 à 6 ans, latence et apprentissage", Canadian Psychiatric Association Journal, Vol. 18, No. 1 (1973), page 62.
11. Canada. Department of National Health and Welfare. Brief presented to the Special Senate Committee on Poverty, Second Session, No. 23 (February, 1970).

12. Statistics Canada. Income Distributions By Size in Canada, 1972, Catalogue No. 13-207 (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1974), page 27.
13. Breton, Raymond. Social and Academic Factors in the Career Decisions of Canadian Youth (Ottawa: Information Canada, 1972).
14. Porter, M. R., Porter, J., and Bleshen, B. Does Money Matter? Prospects for Higher Education (Toronto: Institute for Behavioral Research/York University, 1973), page xi.
15. Alberta. Department of Culture, Youth and Recreation. A Study of Native Youth in Edmonton (Edmonton: 1971), page 114.
16. McRoberts, Hugh. "Follow-up of Grade 12 Students from the Porter-Bleshen Study of Educational Aspirations", a report to the Council of Ontario Universities, June 2, 1974.
17. Martin, G. E. "A Survey of Factors Related to Drop-outs in Grade IX in Newfoundland Central Schools in 1961-62", cited in Pike, Robert, Who Doesn't Get to University - and Why (Ottawa: Runge Press Ltd., 1970), pages 98 and 99.
18. Data compiled for the National Council of Welfare; see footnote 2.
19. Statistics Canada. 1971 Census of Canada: Population: The Out-of-School Population, Catalogue No. 92-743 (Ottawa: Information Canada), Table 7.
20. Canadian Teachers' Federation. "Equal Opportunity to Learn" in The Poor at School in Canada (Ottawa: 1970), page 157.
21. "Ward 7 Schools Lead Toronto in Suspensions", Globe and Mail (Toronto), July 25, 1974.
22. Saskatchewan. Department of Social Services. Client Housing: A Survey of the Housing Conditions of Saskatchewan Assistance Plan Recipients: Adequacy, Rent and Ownership (Regina, 1974), pages 38 and 39.
23. Stephenson, P. Susan. "Myths About Juvenile Delinquency", Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections, Vol. 15, No. 1 (1973), page 83.

24. Ontario. Ministry of Correctional Services. Report of the Minister, 1973 (Toronto), pages 46 and 55.
25. Lambert, Leah and Birkenmayer, Andrew. An Assessment of the Classification System of Placement of Wards in Training Schools, Vol. 3 (Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Correctional Services, 1972), page 8.
26. Alberta. Department of Health and Social Development. Study on the Characteristics of Children Admitted to Alberta Child Welfare Institutions, 1969-1971 (Edmonton: 1974), page 15.
27. Canada. Department of Finance. Budget: Supplementary Information (Ottawa: November, 1974).
28. "Communiqué", Meeting of Federal and Provincial Ministers of Welfare, Ottawa, November 19 and 20, 1974.
29. For methodology of up-dating, see Statistics Canada, Revision of Low-Income Cut-Offs (unpublished paper); for details of 1974 Poverty Lines, see Appendix.
30. Lalonde, Marc. "Income Distribution: A Question of Community Ethics", notes for a speech given to the Empire Club of Canada, Toronto, October 31, 1974.

APPENDIX

POVERTY LINES: 1970

<u>Family Size</u>	<u>Size of area of residence</u>					Rural (farm & non-farm)
	<u>500,000 or more</u>	<u>100,000- 499,999</u>	<u>30,000- 99,999</u>	<u>1,000- 29,999</u>		
1 person	\$2,686	\$2,515	\$2,442	\$2,247		\$1,953
2 persons	3,895	3,647	3,541	3,257		2,833
3 persons	4,970	4,654	4,518	4,157		3,615
4 persons	5,910	5,534	5,373	4,943		4,298
5 persons	6,607	6,186	6,007	5,526		4,806
6 persons	7,253	6,791	6,594	6,066		5,275
7 or more	7,953	7,446	7,229	6,650		5,783

POVERTY LINES: 1974

<u>Family Size</u>	<u>Size of area of residence</u>					Rural (farm & non-farm)
	<u>500,000 or more</u>	<u>100,000- 499,999</u>	<u>30,000- 99,999</u>	<u>1,000- 29,999</u>		
1 person	\$ 3,456	\$3,235	\$3,142	\$2,890		\$2,512
2 persons	5,008	4,690	4,554	4,189		3,644
3 persons	6,391	5,985	5,810	5,347		4,648
4 persons	7,601	7,117	6,909	6,357		5,527
5 persons	8,496	7,955	7,724	7,108		6,181
6 persons	9,328	8,734	8,480	7,801		6,783
7 or more	10,228	9,574	9,297	8,552		7,437

CANADA

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	1,657,017	24.5	5,102,369	75.5	6,759,373
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	413,247	21.4	1,512,890	78.6	1,926,127
100,000- 499,999	180,939	17.8	837,546	82.2	1,018,484
30,000- 99,999	122,679	20.8	468,431	79.2	591,121
1,000- 29,999	288,103	20.6	1,107,421	79.4	1,395,513
Rural (farm and non-farm)	652,049	35.7	1,176,072	64.3	1,828,119
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	1,314,576	21.2	4,879,498	78.8	6,194,087
One-parent male-headed family	46,028	33.7	90,459	66.3	136,487
One-parent female-headed family	296,398	69.1	132,401	30.9	428,799

NEWFOUNDLAND

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u> </u>
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	92,783	45.3	112,181	54.7	204,966
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000- 99,999	10,527	32.7	21,662	67.3	32,188
1,000- 29,999	31,529	39.5	48,364	60.5	79,893
Rural (farm and non-farm)	50,728	54.6	42,156	45.4	92,885
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	83,081	43.7	107,253	56.3	190,333
One-parent male-headed family	2,260	52.2	2,068	47.8	4,327
One-parent female-headed family	7,459	72.4	2,836	27.5	10,307

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	14,111	37.3	23,712	62.7	37,822
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000- 99,999	--	--	--	--	--
1,000- 29,999	3,402	24.6	10,431	75.4	13,833
Rural (farm and non-farm)	10,694	44.6	13,281	55.4	23,976
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	12,493	35.8	22,364	64.2	34,857
One-parent male-headed family	349	40.1	509	58.5	870
One-parent female-headed family	1,256	59.9	829	39.6	2,095

NOVA SCOTIA

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	75,983	29.8	178,949	70.2	254,945
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	11,168	19.5	46,078	80.5	57,247
30,000- 99,999	3,522	29.8	8,334	70.4	11,831
1,000- 29,999	20,776	29.2	50,305	70.8	71,069
Rural (farm and non-farm)	40,518	35.3	74,254	64.7	114,772
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	61,891	26.7	169,882	73.3	231,773
One-parent male-headed family	2,150	37.7	3,564	62.5	5,702
One-parent female-headed family	11,967	68.6	5,502	31.5	17,447

NEW BRUNSWICK

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	75,520	34.9	140,798	65.1	216,319
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000- 99,999	15,322	26.4	42,656	73.6	57,978
1,000- 29,999	17,546	29.8	41,341	70.2	58,901
Rural (farm and non-farm)	42,652	42.9	56,812	57.1	99,465
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	63,612	32.0	135,027	68.0	198,627
One-parent male-headed family	1,878	44.3	2,351	55.4	4,243
One-parent female-headed family	10,017	74.5	3,420	25.4	13,448

QUEBEC

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	528,843	28.1	1,356,017	71.9	1,884,859
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	199,436	26.2	562,425	73.8	761,862
100,000- 499,999	35,168	22.8	119,258	77.2	154,426
30,000- 99,999	38,848	26.9	105,519	73.1	144,366
1,000- 29,999	97,524	24.5	301,107	75.5	398,629
Rural (farm and non-farm)	157,869	37.1	267,698	62.9	425,553
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	437,722	25.2	1,300,301	74.8	1,738,022
One-parent male-headed family	14,267	37.8	23,480	62.2	37,748
One-parent female-headed family	76,854	70.4	32,235	29.6	109,089

ONTARIO

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	400,690	17.1	1,944,223	82.9	2,344,924
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	132,714	17.2	640,871	82.8	773,585
100,000- 499,999	62,837	15.4	344,327	84.6	407,165
30,000- 99,999	42,243	15.2	235,465	84.8	277,708
1,000- 29,999	56,537	13.4	363,951	86.6	420,487
Rural (farm and non-farm)	106,361	22.8	359,618	77.2	465,991
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	291,996	13.6	1,858,221	86.4	2,150,217
One-parent male-headed family	11,058	24.6	33,868	75.4	44,926
One-parent female-headed family	97,637	65.2	52,135	34.8	149,781

MANITOBA

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	95,874	31.6	207,245	68.4	303,106
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	33,523	22.6	114,773	77.4	148,295
100,000- 499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000- 99,999	1,987	23.2	6,583	76.8	8,571
1,000- 29,999	6,968	17.7	32,435	82.3	39,403
Rural (farm and non-farm)	53,381	50.0	53,443	50.0	106,839
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	76,595	27.8	198,608	72.2	275,202
One-parent male-headed family	2,831	43.5	3,664	56.3	6,506
One-parent female-headed family	16,448	76.8	4,951	23.1	21,410

SASKATCHEWAN

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	114,081	38.4	182,801	61.6	296,882
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000-499,999	18,215	22.3	63,665	77.7	81,879
30,000-99,999	2,110	24.3	6,581	75.7	8,691
1,000-29,999	14,783	25.1	44,191	74.9	58,974
Rural (farm and non-farm)	78,974	53.6	68,364	46.4	147,338
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	97,832	35.7	175,887	64.3	273,720
One-parent male-headed family	3,028	52.8	2,702	47.1	5,740
One-parent female-headed family	13,221	75.8	4,202	24.1	17,434

ALBERTA

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	135,150	24.8	409,603	75.2	544,765
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	46,057	16.7	230,270	83.3	276,327
30,000- 99,999	1,822	15.6	9,854	84.4	11,676
1,000- 29,999	17,473	17.7	81,496	82.3	98,981
Rural (farm and non-farm)	69,811	44.2	87,972	55.8	157,782
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	104,250	21.0	392,231	79.0	496,480
One-parent male-headed family	3,782	36.8	6,502	63.2	10,282
One-parent female-headed family	27,132	71.4	10,860	28.6	37,992

BRITISH COLUMBIA

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	116,301	17.9	532,689	82.1	648,990
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	47,563	19.6	194,821	80.4	242,385
100,000- 499,999	7,482	18.1	33,968	81.9	41,440
30,000- 99,999	6,312	16.6	31,788	83.4	38,089
1,000- 29,999	19,937	13.8	124,866	86.2	144,803
Rural (farm and non-farm)	34,995	19.2	147,255	80.8	182,250
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	78,765	13.5	506,434	86.5	585,187
One-parent male-headed family	4,083	26.6	11,253	73.4	15,325
One-parent female-headed family	33,454	69.1	14,993	30.9	48,456

YUKON

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	Number	%	Number	%	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	1,160	17.8	5,345	82.0	6,519
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000-499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000-99,999	--	--	--	--	--
1,000-29,999	451	11.4	3,538	88.9	3,977
Rural (farm and non-farm)	723	28.4	1,818	71.5	2,541
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	834	14.2	5,019	85.6	5,866
One-parent male-headed family	77	31.8	152	62.8	242
One-parent female-headed family	249	59.0	164	38.7	422

NORTHWEST TERRITORIES

	POOR CHILDREN		NON-POOR CHILDREN		TOTAL
	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>%</u>	
<u>ALL CHILDREN</u>	6,489	42.4	8,812	57.6	15,287
<u>BY POPULATION OF AREA</u>					
500,000+	--	--	--	--	--
100,000- 499,999	--	--	--	--	--
30,000- 99,999	--	--	--	--	--
1,000- 29,999	1,176	17.9	5,385	82.1	6,560
Rural (farm and non-farm)	5,329	61.1	3,414	39.1	8,726
<u>BY FAMILY STATUS</u>					
Husband-wife family	5,518	40.0	8,262	60.0	13,781
One-parent male-headed family	264	45.6	302	52.2	578
One-parent female-headed family	692	74.6	236	25.4	929

MEMBERS OF THE

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WELFARE

Ms. Darlene Germscheid (Chairperson)
Winnipeg

M. Jacques Alary
Montreal

Mad. Marguerite Legris
Montreal

Mr. James Albert
Ottawa

Mad. Janine Martin
Trois-Pistoles

Mr. Morris Bartlett
St. John's

Mr. Xavier Michon
Thunder Bay

Ms. Helen Bastien
Montreal

Mad. Céline Morin
Lévis

Mad. Raymonde Bélanger
Quebec City

Mr. Ray Peters
Peterborough

Ms. Jean Blanchard
Charlottetown

Mad. Yolande Savoie
Bouctouche

Mr. Brian Carter
Vancouver

Mr. Alvin Skagen
Moose Jaw

Ms. Marjorie Hartling
Ottawa

Ms. Judy Stainsby
Vancouver

Mr. Alexander Hyndman
Edmonton

Mr. Larry Taman
Toronto

Mr. Greg Johnson
Sydney

* * * * *

National Council of Welfare
Brooke Claxton Building
Ottawa K1A 0K9

Director: Leonard Shifrin

Poor Kids Project Consultants
Leonard Rutman Nancy Amidei



